Project Management Information System aagarwal5@thegef.org

To Do | Projects | Reports | Administration | Help | Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: GEF Project ID [ ] Select

<< Back to Project Edit Save Data

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	1408
Project Title	Biodiversity Conservation and Community Natural Resource Management in the Nanay River Basin (Peruvian Amazon)
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	60765
Country	Peru
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	3 years
CEO Endorsement	05/01/2001
Agency Approval	5/10/2001
Project Effectiveness	06/04/2001
GEF Agency Execution Partners	(Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	Oscar Avalle
TE Reviewer	Brann.Evaluation@gmail.com
TE Peer Reviewer	Neeraj Negi

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	6/30/2004	
Project Actual Completion	6/30/2004	
Project Completion Difference	0	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	06/06/2005	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011	
TE Submission to EO Difference	77	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	02/29/2012	
TER Submission to EO		
TER Submission to EO Difference		Months

Comments on Delays

There was approximately a 6 year delay from the time the TE was completed until it was received by the EO.

The completed TEs for the World Bank are available to the EO immediately through the intranet. WB does not formally submit it to the EO. Earlier on information available with the EO on completed projects was not perfect because the Secretariat did not track this information systematically. Now that this information is being tracked more systematically, it is easier for the EO to identify the completed projects for which terminal evaluations have not been submitted. This project was not reported to have been completed earlier. Therefore, the EO was not able to access its terminal evaluation, even though it could have been accessed.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	748,305		
Cofinance Amount (US$)	802,153		
Total Amount (US$)			

	1,550,458		

Comments on Cofinancing

No final GEF financing or project co-financing data is provided in the TE.

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 2 - Unsatisfactory

Project Objectives -

The project brief does not contain a "proper" logical framework per se - only a table with project outcomes and associated outputs, listed as "indicators". The TE assesses "outcome indicators" compliance per component in Annex 2 of the document, but limited information is presented.

Goal: To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of the biological diversity of the Nanay River Basin, with the participation of local stakeholders. Objective: The overall objective of this project is to contribute to biodiversity conservation through the involvement of local stakeholders in the diversification of sustainable natural resource economic practices and the consolidation and establishment of managed and protected areas.

Comment on Changes

TE indicates no changes occurred.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
(a1) Participatory appraisal of economic and social variables and management practices; (a2) Biodiversity assessments and inventories; (a3) Zoning and mapping of ecological and economic zones; (a4) Land use and management plans; (a5) Categorization and establishment of protected areas; (a6) Drafting a comprehensive Upper and Middle Basin conservation strategy	(a) a proposal for the establishment of a new protected area in the Upper Nanay River Basin will be drafted and presented to local, regional, and national level government institutions and the Reserved Zone of Allpahuayo - Mishana will have received its legal definitive category. (b) A basin participatory conservation strategy, covering species and representative ecosystems, two protected area management	Legal, policy and management tools for biodiversity conservation created			Sustained effective management and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources, with local stakeholder participation.	Biodiversity conserved in the Nanay River Basin	Edit Delete

	plans; two land use planning documents and two biological inventories will be in place.						
(1) Establishment and operation of PAMCs; (2) Management training of local leaders and PAMC stakeholders.	Two Project Area Management Committees (PAMC) with participation of all stakeholders established and functioning. Local zonal committee leaders, community members, and PAMC stakeholders receive management training in project monitoring and evaluation, conflict resolution techniques and in the fulfillment of tasks assigned to PAMCs by the Plan Director.	B. Stronger institutional capacity for biodiversity conservation			Sustained effective management and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources, with meaningful local stakeholder participation.	Biodiversity conserved in the Nanay River Basin	Edit Delete
(1) Testing and validating sustainable resource use practices. (2) Dissemination of proven resource use practices.	Ten commercial alternatives which diversify income generation through sustainable management and added value for local products are tested, disseminated and adopted.	C. Sustainable Resource Management Use through Diversification of Sources of Income			Sustained effective management and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources, with meaningful local stakeholder participation.	Biodiversity conserved in the Nanay River Basin	Edit Delete
(1) Monitoring of project activities. (2) Impact evaluation of project activities. (3) Final project evaluation	Annual reports on changes in key ecosystems and flora and fauna species prepared. Central project inputs and outputs as well as performance indicators publicized in an annual report. End of project monitoring and evaluation report prepared.	D. Data on biodiversity collected (flora, ecosystems and fauna) and project implementation monitored and evaluated			Sustained effective management and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources, with meaningful local stakeholder participation.	Biodiversity conserved in the Nanay River Basin	Edit Delete

Add New Row...

Project Performance

Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments

Overall Project Rating: 5 - Satisfactory

Comment

Comment from TE: "The project was successful in achieving the grant's objectives by promoting a conservation of the unique biodiversity and by reducing the pressure on the natural resources. The project successfully contributed to the certification of forestry permits for communities in the river basin, and a monitoring and evaluation system has been developed in the communities. This system has revealed that illegal exploitation of natural resources has been curtailed and gold dredging has ceased in the basin. Likewise, illegal fishing has decreased compared to the baseline, indicating that the adoption of alternative uses of natural resources in the project's area has been successful."

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes	Last PIR:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	The PIR, which covers the project through June 30, 2004, notes that the project activities have been completed as planned, with wrap up and some consolidation of results which may happen beyond project completion.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Outcome 1 and 3 rated satisfactory, outcomes 2 and 4 rated highly satisfactory. Overall rating of satisfactory is given, without further overall comment.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TE review is available.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project successfully completed each of the components, though it is difficult to assess the level of true progress toward the expected outcomes, given the lack of results-based outcome indicators (as opposed to the simple output indicators provided in the TE).
Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE discusses relevance, but no rating is
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project appears relevant at local, national, international and GEF levels (based on information provided in project brief and TE).
	Terminal Evaluation:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	

			A rating of "fully achieved" is also provided. TE: "The overall project activities fully achieved the grant objectives since they contributed to biodiversity conservation through the involvement of local stakeholders in the diversification of sustainable natural resource economic practices and the consolidation of managed and protected areas. In spite of some limitations mainly due to time and costs, the level of achievement is considered as highly satisfactory."
Effectiveness	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	According to information available in the TE, the project produced a number of successful results that contributed to the expected outcomes and objective. The TE further claims that the project achieved multiple notable impact level results through threat reduction. Overall it appears the project effectively achieved the expected results. Some questions about sustainability of some aspects remain, as further discussed below. In addition, there appear to be multiple indicators the project did not complete, or activities that were scaled down from original plans.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "Overall the executing agency (IIAP) adequately coordinated and managed the grant. The funds were efficiently applied to the execution of the proposed activities within the given time frame for implementation and achievement of grant objectives."
Efficiency	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the information available in the TE, project efficiency is considered satisfactory. There are some indications of efficiency issues faced by the project with respect to project ambitiousness, time constraints on the project manager, and the reduction of scope of some activities, but detailed data is not provided.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Last PIR:	UA - Unable to assess	No sustainability rating provided.
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	Sustainability is discussed, but no rating is
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
Sustainability	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	

			Overall the project has achieved a number of results that should be sustained. There are also multiple aspects that have questionnable sustainability however, particularly the alternative income generating activities (for which the TE notes that there was not time to link communities to markets, but it is expected that the communities will pursue this on their own...) and the environmental monitoring, which does not appear to have a sustained mechanism.
Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No sustainability rating provided.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	There are multiple initiatives mentioned that will build on the results of the project.
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No sustainability rating provided.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	Based on the information available, there appears to be strong stakeholder support for multiple aspects of the project. There are, however, some questions about land tenure related to the establishment of the protected area which may negatively influence the future results of the project's work in this area. The sustainability of some of the alternative income generating activities also appears questionable.
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No sustainability rating provided.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	The final approval of the protected area and the master plan was delayed (at the time of the TE) but appears likely with time.
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No sustainability rating provided.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	There are no significant environmental risks to sustainability mentioned in the TE, and in fact the project has contributed to the reduction of multiple threats.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides a brief summary of the key M&E activities carried out, on pg. 16.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	

			Based on the information available in the TE, it appears that the M&E activities were carried out an a timely and comprehensive manner that supported the project implementation. This included regular World Bank project oversight missions.
M&E Design	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating or information provided on M&E design in project TE.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The project brief does not include a detailed M&E plan, though project and results M&E was covered under the fourth component of the project. It appears the details of these processes were to be specified in the annual project operational plans, based on World Bank standard practices. The M&E component does include a specific item on impact evaluation, which is an important development for a project of this generation, and for a project of this size and duration.
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The primary input to the TE overall M&E rating.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	M&E activities appear to have been completed adequately. The TE does not note any deficiencies in this area.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided in the TE specifically on this issue, though it appears the necessary M&E activities were carried out without budget constraints.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information specifically provided in the TE on this aspect. See comment under TE field. It appears M&E activities were carried out as planned and necessary, without any particular budgetary constraints.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE indicates that many aspects of implementation were strong, but identifies multiple issues in the TE lessons and recommendations at the end of the report.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE indicates that the project was generally well regarded with respect to implementation, although multiple issues are identified in the lessons and recommendations - for example related to "personalization" of some aspects of implementation, requirements for additional staff, language skills, additional M&E capacity, etc.

	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "The Bank's team fiduciary, monitoring and evaluation responsibilities were carried out in asatisfactory manner. The project was constantly monitored and evaluated by World Bank missions." (additional details also provided)
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
Quality of Implementation - IA	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Although general oversight of the project appears to have been adequate, there are multiple issues raised in the TE that are not fully explained and do not have details provided. There seem to have been issues with the scope of the project design, and especially of M&E design, with adequate indicators to monitor progress over time and assess achievement of results. There are also appear to be questions around sustainability that have not been addressed through proper exit strategy planning.
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "The IIAP has kept constant track of project execution in order to respond swiftly to any external or internal factors that could have affected progress. In addition, in accordance with its institutional procedures, when the project ended it formed its internal Project Evaluation Committee, overseen by the Office of Scientific and Technological Cooperation. The coordinator of the Project demonstrated to have great sensitivity towards the communities, high technical capacity and knowledge of the biodiversity of the region, and very good administrative skills. However, the coordinator would have benefited if there had been more staff to support his role in issues related to monitoring and evaluation, and ensuring that the documentation required for means of verification (project documentation) by activity and outcome would be available."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the limited information provided in the TE, project execution appears to have been carried out positively, particularly with respect to working collaboratively with local communities.

Agency Specific Project Criteria

Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating on this aspect given.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	

			This appears to be a strong aspect of the project, with participation and support from a range of stakeholders, and interest by the government and communities to carry on the results.
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating is provided on this aspect -
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	According to the TE, the standard financial management procedures were followed, and financial audits were conducted. It is not clear how financial adaptive management was applied in context of the fact that a number of project activities appear to have been scaled back or dropped.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating is specifically given on this aspect. The TE identifies multiple aspects of the project design that could have been improved, including the over ambitiousness of the scope of the
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	It appears that the project design was overambitious in scope and a number of activities had to be scaled back during implementation - for example the ecotourism
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating on this aspect given. Based on the qualitative information provided, this can be considered a strength of the project.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	There was good stakeholder participation in terms of the range of stakeholders involved. According to the TE, based on the limited scope of the project, only a limited number of families from a limited number of communities were selected for participation in some key activities, such as the alternative income generating
Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	No critical issues identified requiring follow-up. According to the TE, there is some likelihood and interest that the project will be scaled up to a GEF FSP, and may be replicated through the efforts of other initiatives.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	No	No critical issues identified for follow-up, though it would be very interesting to have an ex-post evaluation of a project that was considered to be highly successful at the time of project completion, but for which there were still some open questions about key results and the sustainability of some elements.
	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess	No information provided on this aspect.

Gender Mainstreaming	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess	No information provided on this aspect, despite the fact that community involvement was one of the key aspects of the project.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	The involvement and benefits to the local communities are highlighted throughout the TE, and appear to be one of the highlights of the project, except for remaining questions about land tenure and the sustainability of alternative income generating activities.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	Local benefits were generated with respect to the piloted alternative income generating activities, though sustainability of some aspects is uncertain. There also seem to have been open questions about land tenure issues.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	Socio-economic benefits were generated from the alternative income generating activities. Detailed examples are provided in the TE.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency review provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	Yes - see previous comments on effects on local population and for TE comments under this
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	This was not a relevant issue for the project.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency review provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	This was not a relevant issue for the project.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	N/A
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	N/A
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	N/A

Progress to Impact

	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - High Progress	The TE identifies a number of specific impact level results, and suggests the project contributed significantly to the present and future achievement of impacts. There are open questions about some required follow-up activities however, included the full legal establishment and operation of the protected area supported by the project.

Progress to Impact	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to Assess	No agency review provided.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Significant Progress	The TE identifies multiple impact level results, but it is unclear how a project of this size and scope could have directly contributed to such significant results in such a short period of time. Other aspects should contribute to the achievement of impact level results over time, such as the establishment and ultimate management of the protected area. This appears to be in the early stages however, with full establishment of the protected area not yet legally secured. There are some questions around sustainability, which reduces the potential future progress toward impact.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project produced a level of secondary data on use of biological resources. The project also included a component on community education and awareness, which the TE indicates had significant positive results.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Project included a significant component on community education and awareness, which the TE notes had notable positive results, although quantitative evidence is not provided, and qualitative evidence is limited.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The first project outcome relates to legal, policy, and management tools for biodiversity
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The first project outcome related to the creation of legal, policy and management tools for conservation, which essentially was realized in the form of a proposal for creation of a new protected area. Management planning and land use planning aspects were not completed.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	N/A
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	N/A

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	

Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches			According to the TE, the approaches piloted by the project will be replicated in other areas, though it is not clear exactly which aspects of the project were the relevant pilot or demonstration approaches. Alternative income generating activities were pilot activities.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The alternative income generating activities were considered pilot activities, but it is unclear if there were any specifically unique aspects that were piloted under this project.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project sought to leverage alternative income generating activities as an incentive measure to increase motivation for biodiversity conservation among local communities and
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Alternative income generating activities to promote biodiversity conservation approaches.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "In sum, while few of the proposed studies and manuals were not produced, most of the piloted economic activities did produce the desired effects, contributing to positive outcomes and measurable environmental benefits (to be described below). The Nanay River Project has therefore contributed to the replication of several of these alternative schemes in similar ecosystems in the Amazon basin."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The TE notes that the executing agency (a national civil society organization) is working to replicate the experience in other similar areas, and that the project may also be replicated through a GEF FSP.
	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "given the many positive outcomes of the project, IIAP is working on a proposal for a second phase to the Nanay River Project. This proposal has already been submitted to Peru's GEF focal point, and the Bank has been informed that there is interest at the national level to develop a full size project to replicate the lessons of this project in the Amazon basin."

Upscaling	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	As noted in the TE, there was consideration for a GEF FSP that would build on the experience of this project - unknown if it was realized. The TE also notes some other organizations and relevant initiatives with external donor support that will build on the experience: "the Finnish agency and the Peruvian Government recently approved a project for the Nanay-Pucacuro biological corridor that largely complements and extends the experiences acquired by the Nanay project in conservation and community management for biodiversity conservation."
Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	This was not the strategy or focus of the project, although the project was working to address some natural resource use practices in the region. The project also intended to work on land use planning, which can be considered a mainstreaming approach, but which was not realized.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not a focus of the project strategy. See comments under the TE field above.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
Environmental Stress	Terminal Evaluation	Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	Using a baseline and a matrix with specific criteria and indicators to monitor the evolution and degradation of natural resources in the NRB revealed the following trends during the lifetime of the project: • Gold mining dredging ceased; • Illegal extraction of wood for sawn timber decreased by 89% • Illegal extraction of roundwood decreased by 82% • Illegal extraction of wood for firewood and posts decreased by 77 % • Illegal extraction of irapay palm decreased by 85% • Informal	Edit Delete

Reduction					fishing decreased by 73%	
		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	See figures cited under TE level above. According to the TE, this is based on information provided by the communities, and by relevant government agencies. It is not clear how a project of this size and scope contributed to such significant impact level results in the project timeframe.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
Environmental Status Change	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	TE: "As stated above, 50 fish ponds were built within the lifetime of the project, and contributed to the substitution of damaging activities such as depredatory fishing and logging by aquaculture (fish farming). The fish were sold in Iquitos and were used for local consumption. As an example of the income potential of these	Edit Delete

					activities, during the 2003-2004 season, one family in the community of San Martin was able to sell 333 kilograms of fish (280 units of different types of fish like shad, paco, gamitana and boquichico), which represented an income of $ 2,157.70 Soles (approximately US$654). Another case study in the community of Samito revealed that a family sold 800 kilograms of fish, generating an income of about $3,832.50 Soles (or about US$1,161)."	
Socioeconomic Status Change		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	No further comments beyond the information presented in the TE section above. The TE does also note some potential positive trends in blood and urine levels of mercury related to gold mining, but indicates that these are preliminary and assessing their significance is not possible at the time of the TE.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Comments**			
		UA - Unable to assess	No information provided.			Edit Delete

Arrangements for Impact M&E		Add New Row...		
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.		
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Comments**	
		UA - Unable to assess	No information provided, and M&E appears to have been a weak aspect of the project.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...		

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE has both strengths and significant weaknesses, based on the below criteria. Overall the TE should not be considered as meeting the standards required for GEF projects.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides a summary assessment under each of the anticipated project outcomes. The project did not have strong outcome level indicators, and the TE indicators assessment with respect to qualitative or quantitative analysis related to achievement of outcome indicators is limited
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	According to the TE: "This evaluation still needs to be completed with an on-site verification by the evaluation team."
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE includes a section on sustainability, and seems to appropriately analytically assess various issues related to sustainability, but does not fully break down and cover the four specific aspects of sustainability.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE identifies some useful and important lessons, but doesn't provide detailed information and evidence for the basis of these lessons and recommendations.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	1 - Highly Unsatisfactory	

			The TE does not provide any follow-up financial information. As per World Bank procedures, this information may be included in separate
M&E Asssessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE provides very brief information on some M&E activities, and does not assess this in a comprehensive or consolidated manner. There were some significant issues related to development and application of project indicators, and this is briefly touched on at

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE waxes enthusiastically about a number of project results (perhaps justifiably so) but only briefly mentions areas where expected results, based on indicators, were not achieved. Having read the qualitative assessment of the TE in the body text, it is surprising to see the number of indicators that were not fully achieved in the results tables at the end of the TE.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	According to the TE: "This evaluation still needs to be completed with an on-site verification by the evaluation team."
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Information not available.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Information not available in the TE.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	TORs not included.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	

			At a minimum it must be said that the TE provides limited objective evidence throughout the report, and makes a number of claims without clear justification. At the same time, the TE does not adequately discuss or analyze some project shortcomings. The shortcomings may not be relatively as significant as the positive results, but they need to be fully and appropriately analyzed. One example relates to the alternative income generating activities, for which clear market linkages have not been made, and the TE simply states that it is expected that the communities will do this on their own. There is also limited discussion about the shortcomings of the biodiversity monitoring aspects. Overall it appears the TE provides a positive review, rather than an objective assessment based on the project document and results framework.

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Stakeholder Involvement		Strategic partnerships with oversight institutions, local or regional governments, and associations of communities are important for ensuring that they are co-participants in sustainable development activities;	Edit Delete
Other	Project planning and design	It is necessary to address the causes of current environmental degradation: the lack of community control (extraction by outsiders), and the use of depredatory practices;	Edit Delete
Capacity Building		æ Teaching the local communities to value and respect its resources has led to concrete benefits. It is important to raise awareness on environmental and conservation issues to the communities and lend constant support and empower them in the participatory design of management plans.	Edit Delete
Stakeholder Involvement		æ Law enforcement institutions are constrained by lack of capacity, resources or prone to corruption, and thus, alternative modes such as ILEL co-management promoted through local communities should be considered.	Edit Delete
Capacity Building		Further strengthening of local organizations through zonal committees and the Nanay coordination unit is critical.	Edit Delete
Other	Market development	Alternative commercially viable productive activities must be promoted and linked to markets with the help of competent institutions;	Edit Delete
Other	Project planning and design	Strong commercial interests have to be considered in the design of subprojects (i.e. the proposed eco-tourism activities were rejected by outside pressure).	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

Number of Rows Displayed 10 Rows

Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	

Baseline Data and Information		In projects of this type, it is not feasible to monitor biodiversity directly, but rather through practices that induce changes in the ways natural resources are exploited (this is not to say that measuring environmental quality improvements is not important, but the processes to get there are just as critical).	Edit Delete
Stakeholder Involvement		The personnel working in projects must be trained to manage and resolve disputes in rural communities that may arise during project execution (a working knowledge of local languages is of great importance).	Edit Delete
Financial Planning		æ The project should have employed full-time technical staff on the ground from the outset because full-time technical assistance with resource management is extremely important if the idea is to change deeply rooted patterns of natural resource use.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data

A product of the Global Environment Facility